
6B

Action

Professional Services Committee

Options for the Review of the Accreditation Framework

Executive Summary: In January 2004, the Commission directed the Committee on Accreditation to meet with stakeholders to identify options for establishing a process for the review of the Commission's *Accreditation Framework* that would be open, inclusive of key stakeholders, and consultative. The Committee on Accreditation has endorsed a set of guiding principles for the review and submits three options for the Commission's consideration. Among the three options, the Committee has identified a preferred option for proceeding with the review.

Recommended Action: That the Commission consider the three options for the review of the *Accreditation Framework* set forth by the Committee on Accreditation and act to approve one of the three options.

Presenters: Dr. Larry Birch, Administrator for Accreditation; Cheryl Hickey, Consultant, Professional Services Division; Ed Kujawa and David Madrigal, Co-Chairs, Committee on Accreditation

Options for the Review of the Accreditation Framework

Introduction

In January 2004, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing directed the Committee on Accreditation (COA) to meet with stakeholders to identify options for establishing a process for the review of the Commission's *Accreditation Framework* that would be open, inclusive of key stakeholders, and consultative. Since that time, the Committee on Accreditation has held several meetings with stakeholders to discuss various options for moving forward with the review of the *Accreditation Framework*. This report outlines the COA activities since January and sets forth three options for conducting the review for consideration and action by the Commission.

Background

The Commission is responsible for ensuring that all programs that prepare educators to teach in California's K-12 public schools are of sufficient quality. One critical way that the Commission performs this function is through its system of accreditation which attempts to determine whether, in fact, approved programs are implementing programs that meet the Commission's adopted standards of quality and effectiveness.

The current *Accreditation Framework*, which contains the Commission's accreditation policies, was adopted in 1995 following enactment of SB 148 by Senator Marian Bergeson (Chapter 1455, Statutes of 1988) and SB 655 (Bergeson, Chapter 426, Statutes of 1993). Over the past decade, several major developments have taken place that suggest that a review and possible redesign of the existing system is both timely and appropriate. Such developments include a vastly changed education policy environment demanding greater accountability. Just as significant is a more constrained fiscal environment for the State of California, the Commission, and educational institutions requiring reconsideration of the manner in which responsibilities are carried out. And finally, a review and possible redesign of the existing system is timely because of the completion of an independent evaluation of the system.

Education Code Section 44372 requires that the Commission, with the Committee on Accreditation, jointly design an evaluation of accreditation policies and their implementation, and jointly select an external evaluator to conduct the evaluation. In 1999, the Commission contracted with the American Institutes for Research (AIR) to conduct an independent evaluation of the Commission's *Accreditation Framework*. In March 2003, AIR submitted a final report on its three-year evaluation of the *Framework* and the review. The report contains numerous findings and recommendations.

The COA received and began discussing the findings and recommendations contained in the AIR report in the summer of 2003, leading to the Commission's initial discussion about the scope of

the accreditation review in December 2003. At its January 2004 meeting, the Commission directed the Committee on Accreditation to meet with stakeholders to identify options for establishing a process for the review of the Commission's *Accreditation Framework* that would be open, inclusive of key stakeholders, and consultative.

In a related action, the Commission initially postponed all accreditation visits for the spring of 2003 and the entire 2003-04 state fiscal year, with the exception of those that were to take place in association with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), in order to allow full implementation of the new SB 2042 teacher preparation standards and to conduct a review of the accreditation system. At the Commission's March 2004 meeting, it voted to extend that postponement through the 04-05 fiscal year.

Development of Options for the Review of the Accreditation Framework

COA Meeting, January 22, 2004

The Committee on Accreditation began addressing the Commission's directive at its regularly scheduled meeting on January 22, 2004. At that meeting, the COA invited stakeholders to participate in a discussion centered around two key topics: (1) steps that the Commission and the COA could take to ensure that the review process would be open, inclusive, and consultative, and (2) identification of key issues that should be considered during the review. Further, representatives of the California State University, University of California, and Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities presented a suggested process for the accreditation review. A critically important component of this proposal was the notion that the stakeholders would fiscally support the cost of their participation in the review process. Members of COA participated in a discussion with stakeholders about the proposal and issues related to the review process. A complete list of committee members and stakeholders participating in this meeting is included in this agenda item as Attachment A.

At that January meeting, the Committee on Accreditation determined that further discussion of options for structuring the review of the *Framework* was warranted. The Committee established a subcommittee, comprised of five COA members, including the two Co-Chairs, and three additional members. The subcommittee included representatives from both K-12 and higher education. The members of the subcommittee were:

- | | | | |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|
| • | Ed Kujawa | Co-Chair, Committee on Accreditation | (Higher Education) |
| • | David Madrigal | Co-Chair, Committee on Accreditation | (K-12) |
| • | Lynne Cook | Member, COA | (Higher Education) |
| • | Dana Griggs | Member, COA | (K-12) |
| • | Sue Teele | Member, COA | (Higher Education) |

COA Subcommittee Meeting, February 26, 2004

The subcommittee meeting was held on February 26, at the Commission offices. The meeting was an open and noticed public meeting. The five subcommittee members met with stakeholders to identify and discuss possible options for the review of the *Accreditation Framework*. A complete list of participants at this meeting is included as Attachment B to this item.

The COA and the stakeholders first discussed a set of guiding principles for the establishment of the review process. Comments from both COA members and stakeholders at the January 22 meeting of the COA were used to draft a preliminary set of guiding principles to serve as a starting point for the discussion. The draft guiding principles were intended to collectively reflect these comments and to serve as a framework for further discussion about the structure of the review process. The COA subcommittee and stakeholders agreed to present the guiding principles to the full COA at its meeting on March 18.

The COA subcommittee members and stakeholders in attendance also discussed four possible options for the review process. Two of the options were eliminated due to the potential costs involved and the anticipated logistical complexity involved. Two other options were discussed at length, including the proposal from the higher education community. The advantages and disadvantages of each of the options were identified and discussed.

From this discussion, consensus began to emerge around the development of a new option. This new option included key aspects of the other two proposals that the COA subcommittee members and stakeholders identified as strong components. The new option included structural components to address some of the concerns that had been raised throughout the discussion.

The subcommittee presented all three options to the full COA at its meeting in March, with the new and collectively developed option identified as the “preferred option.”

COA Meeting, March 18, 2004

The Committee on Accreditation met with stakeholders again at its regularly scheduled meeting on March 18th. A complete list of participants in this meeting is included as Attachment C to this agenda item.

At this meeting, the COA considered, modified, and then unanimously endorsed a preliminary set of guiding principles to help guide the establishment of a process for reviewing the *Accreditation Framework*. The term preliminary is used by the COA and stakeholders to recognize that as the process evolves, additions to the list may be necessary. These preliminary guiding principles are as follows:

The review process should:

1. Ensure involvement of an adequate cross section of stakeholders including adequate representation from teachers. Develop a subcommittee/workgroup structure that is inclusive of the cross section of stakeholders.
2. Consider the inclusion of the entire learning-to-teach continuum in the review of the accreditation of educator preparation. Include representation from those involved in subject matter preparation and the induction community.

3. Workgroup(s) should have a clear charge. The number and type of groups established should be based on a needs analysis and scope of work of the planned review.
4. Build into the process adequate time for implementing “sunshine” strategies, that is, public review and input of ideas and proposals for redesign.
5. Establish a variety of public input options. These might include:
 - establishment of workgroup(s)
 - use of focus groups
 - public hearings
 - surveys including web-based options
 - field reviews
 - other strategies to maximize stakeholder input throughout the process.
6. Establish a planned schedule for completion of the review.
7. Establish group norms that guide group activities regarding various aspects of the review. Establish criteria for representation, role expectations, and responsibilities of stakeholder members. For example, reporting to and from constituency groups, development of options or recommendations for consideration, the role and involvement of the CCTC staff and COA membership.
8. Establish a process that is iterative, that is, there is frequent communication among workgroup(s), the COA, and the Commission.
9. Include consideration of transition issues and adequacy of time required for implementation.

Next, the COA and stakeholders discussed all three options sent forth from the subcommittee as developed with participation from the stakeholders. Together, the COA and stakeholders further refined the subcommittee-identified preferred option at this meeting. The COA voted to submit to the Commission all three options for consideration. In addition, it unanimously endorsed the preferred option developed by the subcommittee and stakeholders. Option C in the chart that follows is the COA endorsed preferred option. The chart below describes various characteristics of the three options to be considered by the Commission, and includes advantages and disadvantages of each as identified by the COA members and stakeholders. A fiscal analysis of each of the options follows the chart.

OPTIONS FOR CONDUCTING ACCREDITATION REVIEW AND REDESIGN

<i>OPTIONS</i>	<i>CHARGE/PROCESS</i>	<i>FISCAL ISSUES</i>	<i>ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES</i>
<p>Option A. COA in leadership role, form Working Group of 12-15 individuals to review and possibly redesign the accreditation system over the next six to nine months.</p> <p>Working Group will consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Two reps from each of the three segments of higher ed chosen by segments; b) Two reps from K-12 school districts or COEs that have CCTC-approved teacher ed programs; c) 2 reps from K-12 education community, including teachers and administrators; d) the COA (undetermined number); e) 2 CCTC staff. 	<p><i>Structural Characteristics</i> With COA in a leadership role, working group develops and implements a six to nine month workplan for completing the review and possible redesign. Workplan would take into consideration the existing framework, AIR evaluation, and contextual factors.</p> <p>Single working group responsible for much of the research, issue exploration, and identification of options for possible redesign. Workgroup would present review and possible redesign options to the COA for action. COA to take review and possible redesign options to Commission for consideration and action.</p> <p>Workgroup members would be required to be vested with the authority to represent/speak on behalf of their institution, organization or constituency group. They would commit to communicating regularly with their respective constituency groups and reporting feedback from those groups.</p> <p><i>Subcommittees</i> Work group members could identify areas requiring further expertise, establish ad-hoc subcommittees as needed, and bring various issues together in a holistic fashion.</p> <p><i>Reporting</i> Through staff, COA would provide regular reports to the Commission throughout the design process.</p>	<p>Each segment represented on working group commits to supporting costs of their segmental participation in review and possible redesign process.</p> <p>Fiscal analysis is included in further detail separately in agenda item.</p>	<p><i>Advantages</i> Key stakeholders are included in a substantive way in the process.</p> <p>Establishing a single working group would be cost-efficient.</p> <p>Responsibility for review and possible redesign is placed on working group ensuring greater buy-in from stakeholders.</p> <p>Working Group would be responsible for bringing various issues together in a holistic fashion.</p> <p><i>Disadvantages</i> Concerns raised over constitution of the working group. Some voiced support for including greater representation from K-12, including teachers and teacher groups.</p> <p>Proposed constitution of working group does not include entire learning-to-teach continuum, including subject matter and induction.</p> <p>Connection to and communication with COA needs strengthening. Relationship of workgroup to COA needs to ensure on-going dialogue and discussion to ensure common goals and objectives.</p> <p>Assumes districts can support representation.</p>

<i>OPTIONS</i>	<i>CHARGE/PROCESS</i>	<i>FISCAL ISSUES</i>	<i>ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES</i>
<p>Option B. COA in leadership role, establish issue-oriented work groups comprised of COA members and stakeholders.</p> <p>Issue-oriented workgroups could either be comprised of the same stakeholders as proposed in options A and C (single accreditation study working group) or be supplemented by individuals with particular expertise.</p> <p>Four COA meetings with embedded work group meetings would be supplemented by additional work group meetings (held separate from COA meetings). One to two COA members would participate in all work group meetings.</p>	<p><i>Structural Characteristics</i> COA, in consultation with stakeholders, would identify key issues needing attention during accreditation review. Issue-oriented workgroups comprised of stakeholders and COA members would be established to address topical areas.</p> <p>Various issue-oriented workgroups would be responsible for research, issue exploration, and recommendations pertaining to the relevant topical areas. COA would be responsible for bringing the various issues together in a cohesive manner. COA to take review and possible redesign options to the Commission for consideration and action.</p> <p>Issue-oriented workgroups would provide regular reports and redesign options to the COA throughout the design process.</p> <p><i>Reporting</i> Through staff, COA would provide regular reports throughout the design process.</p>	<p>Although segmental representatives would support the cost of their participation, concerns raised over the cost of this option.</p> <p>Commission to cover the cost of 1-2 COA members on each work group for the separate work group meetings (those held outside of COA meetings).</p> <p>Fiscal analysis is included in further detail separately in agenda item.</p>	<p><i>Advantages</i> Because of the potentially large number of accreditation-related issues that may be involved in the review and possible redesign, work groups focused on particular issues could simultaneously facilitate research and in-depth discussion of topics in an efficient manner.</p> <p>Experts from the field on the particular topics at hand could be tapped to provide unique perspectives and assistance.</p> <p>Embedding a few of the meetings within COA meetings could provide some cohesiveness in goals and outcomes.</p> <p><i>Disadvantages:</i> Utilizing numerous work groups has significant cost implications – institutions would not be able to support representation on all workgroups.</p> <p>Embedded workgroup meetings would ensure some minimum level of cohesiveness, but ensuring a coherent product would prove challenging.</p> <p>Representatives on the various workgroups could provide significant input on a particular matter, but may not be empowered to speak on behalf of their system, institution or organization.</p> <p>Stakeholders expressed concern that this approach does not meet the spirit of Commission direction or COA approved motion for inclusiveness.</p> <p>Stakeholders would have limited role in “putting the pieces together” once the workgroups have completed their various charges.</p> <p>Assumes districts can support representation.</p>

OPTIONS	CHARGE/PROCESS	FISCAL ISSUES	ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES
<p>Option C. Group Identified Preferred Option. COA in leadership role, form Accreditation Study Working Group of not more than 20 individuals to review and possibly redesign the accreditation system over the next six to nine months. The group will consist of the following representatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Two representatives from each of the three segments of higher education chosen by segments; b) Two representatives from K-12 school district or County Office of Education with a CCTC-approved teacher education program c) Two representatives from teaching profession – one from the California Teachers Association and one from the California Federation of Teachers. d) One representative from the Association of California School Administrators e) One representative from the California School Boards Association f) One representative from subject matter programs g) One representative from induction programs h) Four members of the COA – two representing higher education and two representing K-12. 	<p>Structural Characteristics With COA in a leadership role, working group develops and implements a six to nine month workplan for completing the review and possible redesign. Workplan would take into consideration the existing framework, AIR evaluation, and contextual factors.</p> <p>Single working group responsible for much of the research, issue exploration, and identification of options for redesign to go to the COA for consideration and action. COA to take review and possible redesign options to Commission for consideration and action.</p> <p>Working group would be co-facilitated by one COA representative and one individual chosen by the stakeholders. Three to four joint meetings of working group and COA would be held to share ideas, perspectives, and facilitate common understandings and objectives.</p> <p>Working group members would be required to be vested with the authority to represent/speak on behalf of their institution, organization or constituency group. They would commit to communicating regularly with their respective constituency groups and reporting feedback from those groups.</p> <p>Subcommittees Working Group could identify areas requiring further expertise and establish ad-hoc subcommittees as needed.</p> <p>Consensus Model Working Group would operate on a consensus model. Where consensus is not reached, different perspectives will be reflected in documentation.</p> <p>Reporting Through staff, COA would provide regular reports to the Commission throughout the design process.</p>	<p>Each segment represented on working group commits to supporting costs of their segmental participation in review and possible redesign process.</p> <p>Cost to the Commission will include those required to support four COA members to participate in three to six workgroup meetings held separately from COA meetings.</p> <p>Fiscal analysis is included in further detail separately in agenda item.</p>	<p>Advantages Key stakeholders are included in a substantive way in the process.</p> <p>Establishing a single working group would be cost-efficient.</p> <p>Responsibility for review and possible redesign is placed on working group ensuring greater buy-in from stakeholders.</p> <p>Separate meetings of the working group (apart from COA) would maintain internal integrity of the group, while joint meetings would help ensure that COA and the working group are working toward common goals and objectives.</p> <p>Relationship of working group with COA as well as co-facilitation structure would represent a mutually cooperative environment and would allow for on-going dialogue throughout the process.</p> <p>Working Group would be responsible for bringing various issues together in a holistic fashion.</p> <p>Inclusion of representative from induction and subject matter will ensure the review and possible redesign accounts for pertinent issues related to educator preparation throughout the learning-to-teach continuum.</p> <p>Disadvantages Assumes districts can support representation.</p>

Fiscal Analysis of Options

The table below shows the estimated costs to the Commission but does not include the costs to the organizations or educational systems that will have representatives serving on the accreditation study workgroup(s). As previously noted, the stakeholder groups will financially support the cost of their participation.

All three options have one common assumption. It is that, because the Commission continues to conduct merged accreditation visits for those institutions seeking accreditation from both the Commission and NCATE, the Committee on Accreditation's regular calendar of meetings for 2004-2005 will need to take place regardless of the accreditation review activities. Four of those regular calendar of meetings will include significant time devoted to accreditation review and possible redesign activities, regardless of the option chosen by the Commission. Estimated expenditures for each Committee on Accreditation meeting is \$3,200 for a total cost for four meetings of \$12,800. Because these costs are common to all three options, they are not reflected on the chart that follows.

Accreditation Review Options - Costs to the Commission

	Cost to the Commission*
Option A: Six to nine workgroup meetings—six representatives from three segments of higher education, two representatives from K-12 school districts or COEs that sponsor teacher preparation programs, two representatives from K-12 education community, two COA members.	<i>Per meeting cost:</i> \$600 (includes travel cost of two COA members per meeting) <i>Total Estimated Cost:</i> \$3,600 (six meetings) to \$5,400 (nine meetings)
Option B: This option includes four COA meetings with embedded issue oriented workgroup meetings as well as additional issue oriented workgroup meetings held separately from COA meetings. Estimate of six to twelve workgroup meetings. COA representatives on each workgroup. Actual cost will vary depending on the actual number of workgroups established and number of meetings required.	<i>Per Meeting Cost:</i> \$600 to \$1,200 (includes travel cost of 1 COA member on each of 2-4 workgroups) <i>Total Estimated Cost:</i> Estimate varies depending on number of workgroups and number of meetings. Total could range from \$3,600 (2 workgroups meeting 6 times) to \$14,400 (4 workgroups groups meeting 12 times).
Option C: This option includes three to four COA meetings. Three to six additional workgroup meetings—six representatives from three segments of higher education, two representatives from K-12 school districts or COEs that sponsor teacher preparation programs, one representative each from CTA and CFT, one representative from ACSA, one representative each from CSBA, subject matter programs, and induction programs, and four COA members. First meeting to be two-day meeting.	<i>Per meeting cost:</i> \$1200 (includes travel cost of 4 COA members per one-day meeting); \$1,800 (for two-day initial meeting). <i>Total Estimated Cost:</i> \$4,200 (three meetings, including one two-day meeting) to \$7,800 (six meetings, including one two-day meeting).

**To assist in the estimation of the cost associated with the three options, the actual cost of the accreditation subcommittee meeting held on February 26, and the estimated cost of the May 2004 COA meeting have been utilized. (COA Subcommittee Meeting, February 26, 2004=\$1,190; COA Meeting, May 20, 2004=\$3,180)*

Initiating the Review Process

Once the Commission has selected an option for moving forward with the review of the *Accreditation Framework*, several steps will need to be taken to initiate the process. These steps will vary depending on the option chosen by the Commission.

If the Commission acts to approve either Option A or C:

1. *Seek Stakeholder Representation*
Immediately following Commission action, a letter from the Commission's Executive Director will be sent to identified stakeholder organizations requesting the names of individuals designated to serve on the accreditation study working group. The Executive Director, on behalf of the Commission, will then send confirmation letters to the individuals.
2. *May, 2004, COA Meeting*
The next meeting of the COA will take place on May 20 at the Commission offices. Additional conversation with the stakeholders will take place at this meeting.

COA will use this meeting:

- To identify its members to serve on the accreditation study group.
- To identify who will serve as the co-facilitator of the accreditation study group.
- To consider its 2004-05 schedule of meetings in light of projected needs to support and accomplish the review of the *Framework*.

In particular, the COA can use this meeting to discuss with key stakeholders the following issues:

- Development of goals for the review of the *Accreditation Framework*
 - Refinement of the charge of the *Accreditation Study Working Group*
 - Development of a workplan for the review and establish a schedule for the review
 - Address the issue of transition to new system and time required.
3. *First Official Meeting of the Accreditation Study Working Group – Tentatively set for June 16-17, 2004*
The specific agenda for this meeting will be developed in consultation with stakeholders, however, possible/suggested activities for this meeting could include:

- Establish and finalize a workplan for the review and establish a schedule for the review, including identification of appropriate times to meet jointly with COA.
 - Review the AIR report.
 - Identify challenging issue/topical areas that will require additional expertise. Reach agreement on how these areas will be addressed.
 - Begin implementation of the workplan.
4. *Update of Review Activities at the Commission's August meeting*
 In keeping with the guiding principle that the process be iterative, and that there is frequent communication between the accreditation study working group, the COA, and the Commission, an update of activities of the review will be provided to the Commission at its meeting in August.

If the Commission acts to approve Option B:

1. *May, 2004, COA Meeting*
 Because this option requires the identification of topical areas for which workgroups would be established, among the first tasks of the COA, with participation of stakeholders, would be to identify the major topical areas for which working groups would be established. As a result, the COA meeting could be used to achieve the following:
- Utilizing the issue areas identified by stakeholders at the January meeting of the COA, major topical areas could be agreed upon that will serve as the basis for formulating workgroups.
 - Develop explicit charge for each of the issue-oriented workgroups.
 - Consider its 2004-05 schedule of meetings in light of projected needs to support and accomplish the review of the *Framework*.
 - Develop goals for the review of the *Framework*.
 - Develop a workplan for the review and establish a schedule for the review.
 - Identify the COA members to serve on each workgroup.
 - Address the issue of transition to new system and time required.
2. *June 2004, Seek Stakeholder Representation*
 Having identified issue oriented workgroups, a letter from the Commission's Executive Director will be sent to identified stakeholders requesting the names of individuals designated to serve on the various working groups. The Executive Director, on behalf of the Commission, will then send confirmation letters to the individuals with notification of the first meeting.

3. *August, 2004. First official meeting of Issue-Oriented Working Groups in Conjunction with COA meeting*

Each issue-oriented workgroup would need to:

- Identify the major issues related to their specific topical areas and develop issue-specific workplan to accomplish the related tasks.
- Establish a schedule for review.

4. *Update of Review Activities at the Commission's August meeting*

In keeping with the guiding principle that the process be iterative, and that there is frequent communication between the accreditation study working groups, the COA, and the Commission, an update of activities of the review will be provided to the Commission at its meeting in August.

Attachment A

Committee on Accreditation January 22, 2004 Participants

Members of the Committee on Accreditation

Ed Kujawa	COA Co-Chair (Dominican University)
David Madrigal	COA Co-Chair (Antioch Unified School District)
Lynne Cook	COA Member (California State University, Northridge)
Diane Doe	COA Member (San Francisco Unified School District)
Dana Griggs	COA Member (Ontario Montclair School District)
Karen O 'Connor	COA Member (Poway Unified School District)
Ruth Sandlin	COA Member (California State University San Bernardino)
Sue Teele	COA Member (University of California, Riverside)
Donna Uyemoto	COA Member (Dublin Unified School District)
Irma Guzman Wagner	COA Member (California State University, Stanislaus)

Participants/Stakeholders

Glen Basey	William Jessup University
Steve Betando	Association of California School Administrators
Emily Brizendine	California State University, Hayward
Cathy Buell	San Jose State University
Dolly Casco	University of California, San Diego
Brant Choate	University of Phoenix
Robin Churo	California State University, Fresno
Bonnie Crawford	Concordia University, California Credential Counselors and Analysts of California (CCAC)
Stephanie Farland	California School Boards Association
JoAnn Hammer	National University
Terry Janicki	California State University, Chico
Lon Kellenberger	California State University, Bakersfield
Mike Kotar	California State University, Chico
Gretchen Laue	University of California, San Diego
Steve Lilly	California State University, San Marcos (Member, CCTC)
Helene T. Mandell	Cal State Teach
Maria Marin	InterAmerican College
Diane Mayer	University of California, Berkeley
Nina Moore	University of California Office of the President
Ellen Curtis Pierce	Chapman University

Bob Polkinghorn	University of California Office of the President
Linda Purrington	Pepperdine University
Jim Richmond	California State University, Chico
Dan Sackheim	California Department of Education
Veronica Villalobos	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Bill Wilson	California State University Chancellor 's Office
	Ex-officio Member, Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Beverly Young	California State University Chancellor 's Office

Attachment B

Committee on Accreditation Accreditation Review Process Meeting February 26, 2004 Participants

Members of the Committee on Accreditation

Ed Kujawa	COA Co-Chair (Dominican University)
David Madrigal	COA Co-Chair (Antioch Unified School District)
Dana Griggs	COA Member (Ontario Montclair School District)
Lynne Cook	COA Member (California State University, Northridge)
Sue Teele	COA Member (University of California, Riverside)

Participants/Stakeholders

Joyce Abrams	California Teachers Association
Steve Betando	Association of California School Administrators
Cathy Buell	San Jose State University, BIR Member
Bonnie Crawford	California Credential Counselors and Analysts of California
Bob Polkinghorn	University of California Office of the President
Veronica Villalobos	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Beverly Young	California State University Chancellor's Office

Attachment C

Committee on Accreditation March 18, 2004 Participants

Members of the Committee on Accreditation

Ed Kujawa	COA Co-Chair	(Dominican University)
David Madrigal	COA Co-Chair	(Antioch Unified School District)
Lynne Cook	COA member	(California State University, Northridge)
Diane Doe	COA member	(San Francisco Unified School District)
Irma Guzman Wagner	COA member	(California State University, Stanislaus)
Karen O'Connor	COA member	(Poway Unified School District)
Ruth Sandlin	COA member	(California State University, San Bernardino)
Sue Teele	COA member	(University of California, Riverside)
Donna Uyemoto	COA member	(Dublin Unified School District)

Participants/Stakeholders

Joyce Abrams	California Teachers Association
Glen Basey	William Jessup University
Steve Betando	Association of California School Administrators
Emily Brizendine	California State University, Hayward
Cathy Buell	San Jose State University
Linda Childress	Riverside, Inyo, Mono, San Bernardino Counties BTSA
Joel Colbert	University of Southern California
Karen Symms Gallagher	University of Southern California/Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (Member, CCTC)
Judith Grieg	Notre Dame de Namur University
Bruce Kitchen	San Diego and San Bernardino Counties Human Resources Office
David Marsh	University of Southern California
Bob Polkinghorn	University of California, Office of the President
Sharon Robison	Association of California School Administrators
Sue Westbrook	California Federation of Teachers

